This elections seemunusually weighty in its policy implications. In terms of energy and climate policy, the two parties parties are far apart — Republicans favor energy dominance through massive fossil fuel production, Demorats favor clean energy. To the immense frustration of people on both sides, things haven't moved much since September, when I last wrote about the state of the race.

As usual, I'm basing my assessment on two experienced prognosticators, Sabato and Cook, so at least you know I'm not cherry-picking assessments. They may be wrong, but at least they know more than I do about these things.

The Presidential Race

The state of play. When I wrote in September, the presidential race looked like a dead heat. There was a long list of toss-up states: Arizona Georgia, Michigan, North Carolina, Nevada, Wisconsin, and Pennsylvania. The Democrats had a slight edge in terms of electoral votes that are leading, likely, or solid. My bottom line: was that it was an extremely tight race that could go either way. That remains unchanged. The same states are still toss-ups, and the presidential election remains a dead heat.

Why it matters. This should be self-evident. Trump favors a major buildout of fossil fuel production, while Harris favors clean energy.

The Senate.

The state of play. Now, as was also true last month, Democrats have an uphill battle in the Senate. Manchin's seat in West Virginia almost certainly goes Republican. As of last month, Ohio was a toss-up, Montana leaned slightly Republican, and Michigan leaned slightly Democratic. Ohio is still a toss-up. Montana leans a little more clearly Republican now, Michigan continues to lean slightly Democratic, and Wisconsin is also now leaning only slightly Democratic.

To counter any lost seats, the Democrats would have to win races in Nebraska, Texas, or Florida. Democratic wins in those states aren't impossible but they're definitely long shots. The Democrats have somewhat better odds in Texas than the other two states, but it would still be a massive upset if they ousted Ted Cruz.

Why it matters. If Harris wins, GOP control of the Senate would make it harder to get her nominees confirmed.. If Democrats did manage to capture the House and

the Senate, Harris could use the reconciliation procedure tro pass more laws like the Inflation Reduction Act. If Trump wins, a GOP Senate would give him a lot of leeway in choosing nominees, and if the GOP also takes the House, he could use the reconciliation process to slash the EPA budget, repeal pasts of the IRA, and subsidize fossil fuels.

If the GOP wins the Senate, the margin also matters. A one-vote margin would give moderates like Collins and Murkowski a lot of influence. A three or four vote margin would shift more power to the conservative wing of the party.

The House

The state of play. In September, Republicans had a small edge in the House — 208 races that were at least leaning their way, compared with 203 for the Democrats. The number of toss-up seats has diminished slightly, but we are basically in the same place: Republicans would win House control narrowly if the toss-up seats divided exactly evenly, but basically it's too close to call.

Why it matters. If Trump wins, control of the House would almost certainly mean a trifecta, since Republicans are likely to get control of the Senate. That would immunize him from congressional investigations and allow the use of the reconciliation procedure to avoid Senate filibusters on spending and tax issues. On the other hand, if Democrats got control of the House, they could block Trump's funding or spending bills and use the House to launch investigations of the Administration. If Harris wins but the Republicans win the Senate, control of the House wouldn't matter quite as much, but it would increase her bargaining power over legislation.